arXiv:1407.3639v1 [math.PR] 14 Jul 2014

Sampling Parts of Random Integer Partitions: A Probabilistic and Asymptotic Analysis

Ljuben Mutafchiev
American University in Bulgaria, 2700 Blagoevgrad, Bulgaria
and Institute of Mathematics and Informatics of the
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
e-mail: ljuben@aubg.bg; tel.: +359 73 888498

Abstract

Let λ be a partition of the positive integer n, selected uniformly at random among all such partitions. Corteel et al. (1999) proposed three different procedures of sampling parts of λ at random. They obtained limiting distributions of the multiplicity $\mu_n = \mu_n(\lambda)$ of the randomly-chosen part as $n \to \infty$. The asymptotic behavior of the part size $\sigma_n = \sigma_n(\lambda)$, under these sampling conditions was found by Fristedt (1993) and Mutafchiev (2014). All these results motivated us to study the relationship between the size and the multiplicity of a randomly-selected part of a random partition. We describe it obtaining the joint limiting distributions of (μ_n, σ_n), as $n \to \infty$, for all these three sampling procedures. It turns out that different sampling plans lead to different limiting distributions for (μ_n, σ_n). Our results generalize those obtained earlier and confirm the known expressions for the marginal limiting distributions of μ_n and σ_n.

Key words: integer partitions, part sizes, random sampling, limiting distributions

Mathematics Subject classifications: 05A17, 60C05, 60F05

1 Introduction

Partitioning integers into summands (parts) is a subject of intensive research in combinatorics, number theory and statistical physics. If n is a positive integer, then by a partition, λ, of n, we mean a representation

$$\lambda : \quad n = \sum_{j=1}^{n} j m_j, \tag{1.1}$$

in which m_j, called multiplicities of parts $j, j = 1, 2, ..., n$, are non-negative integers. We use $\Lambda(n)$ to denote the set of all partitions of n and let $p(n) =\mid \Lambda(n) \mid$. The number $p(n)$ is determined asymptotically by the famous partition formula of Hardy and Ramanujan [9]:

$$p(n) \sim \frac{1}{4n\sqrt{3}} \exp\left(\pi\sqrt{\frac{2n}{3}}\right), \quad n \to \infty. \tag{1.2}$$

A precise asymptotic expansion for $p(n)$ was found later by Rademacher [14] (more details may be also found in [2; Chapter 5]). For instance, Rademacher's result implies that

$$p(n) = \frac{1}{4n\sqrt{3}} \exp\left(\pi\sqrt{\frac{2n}{3}}\right) - \frac{1}{4\pi\sqrt{2}n^{3/2}} \exp\left(\pi\sqrt{\frac{2n}{3}}\right)$$
$$+O\left(\exp\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\sqrt{\frac{2n}{3}}\right)\right), \quad n \to \infty. \tag{1.3}$$

Further on, we assume that, for fixed integer $n \geq 1$, a partition $\lambda \in \Lambda(n)$ is selected uniformly at random (uar), i.e. with probability $1/p(n)$. In this way, each numerical characteristic of λ can be regarded as a random variable defined on the space $\Lambda(n)$.

Corteel et al. [3] proposed and studied three procedures of sampling parts of a random partition $\lambda \in \Lambda(n)$. Basic statistics of a randomly selected part are the part size and its multiplicity. Corteel et al. [3] focused on the multiplicity $\mu_{n,j} = \mu_{n,j}(\lambda)$ $(j = 1, 2, 3,)$ of the randomly-selected part and found limiting distributions for $\mu_{n,j}$, as $n \to \infty$, in these three cases of sampling (here the subscript j specifies the concrete sampling procedure that is followed; the definitions of these three sampling procedures will be given in the next section). In the same way, let $\sigma_{n,j} = \sigma_{n,j}(\lambda)$ $(j = 1, 2, 3)$ be the size of the randomly-selected part. Limit theorems for $\sigma_{n,j}$ were obtained in [6] and [13]. All these results motivated us to study the relationship between the size and the multiplicity of a randomly-selected part of a random integer partition. We describe it obtaining the joint limiting distributions of $\mu_{n,j}$ and $\sigma_{n,j}$ (j=1,2,3) as $n \to \infty$. Our results generalize those obtained earlier in [6,3,13] and confirm the known expressions for the marginal limiting distributions of $\mu_{n,j}$ and $\sigma_{n.j}$.

We organize our paper as follows. In Section 2 we describe the sampling procedures proposed by Corteel et al. [3]. The main results of this paper are stated in Section 3. The method of proof is also briefly described there. Section 4 contains some auxiliary facts on generating functions and some asymptotics that we need further. We present the proofs of our limit theorems in Sections 5 - 7.

2 Basic Random Variables and Definitions of the Sampling Procedures

For any $\lambda \in \Lambda(n)$ selected uar, we define the random variables

$$\alpha_j^{(n)} = \alpha_j^{(n)}(\lambda) = \text{the number of parts of size } j \text{ in } \lambda.$$

By I_A we denote the indicator of an event A and, for any two real numbers $d, s \geq 1$ and integer $m \geq 1$, we set

$$Z_{d,s}^{(n)} = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq s} \alpha_j^{(n)} I_{\{\alpha_j^{(n)} \leq d\}}, \tag{2.1}$$

$$Y_{m,s}^{(n)} = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq s} I_{\{\alpha_j^{(n)} = m\}}. \tag{2.2}$$

($Z_{d,s}^{(n)}$ counts the number of parts of size not grater than s and multiplicity not greater than d in a randomly-chosen partition λ, while $Y_{m,s}^{(n)}$ is the number of distinct parts with multiplicity m and size not greater than s). Obviously,

$$Z_n = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_j^{(n)} \tag{2.3}$$

equals the total number of parts and

$$Y_n = \sum_{j=1}^{n} I_{\{\alpha_j^{(n)} > 0\}} \tag{2.4}$$

- the number of distinct parts in $\lambda \in \Lambda(n)$.

To describe the sampling procedures introduced by Corteel et al. [3] we notice that they are two-step procedures that combine the outcomes of two experiments. Therefore, they lead to three different product probability spaces. Since in each procedure we first sample uar a partition $\lambda \in \Lambda(n)$, the probability space on $\Lambda(n)$, equipped with the uniform probability measure $Pr(\lambda \in \Lambda(n)) = 1/p(n)$, is included in each product space. The second steps of sampling are, however, different and therefore, for each different procedure we obtain a different product space and different product probability measure. In what follows next, we adopt the common notation $\mathbb{P}(.)$ for the product probability measure of each sampling procedure and follow the concept of a product space developed in [8; Chapter 1.6]. By $\mathbb{E}(X)$ we denote the expected value of the random variable X defined on the integer partition space $\Lambda(n)$.

Procedure 1. Given a partition $\lambda \in \Lambda(n)$ chosen uar (step 1), we select a part uar among all Z_n parts of λ (without any bias, step 2). By the product measure formula [8; Chapter 1.6], (2.1) and (2.3)

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}(\{\lambda \in \Lambda(n)\} \times \{\mu_{n,1} \leq d, \sigma_{n,1} \leq s\}) \\ &= Pr(\lambda \in \Lambda(n))\mathbb{P}(\mu_{n,1} \leq d, \sigma_{n,1} \leq s) = \left(\frac{1}{p(n)}\right)\left(\frac{Z_{d,s}^{(n)}}{Z_n}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Summation over all $\lambda \in \Lambda(n)$ yields

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu_{n,1} \leq d, \sigma_{n,1} \leq s) = \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{Z_{d,s}^{(n)}}{Z_n}\right). \tag{2.5}$$

Procedure 2. Given a partition $\lambda \in \Lambda(n)$ chosen uar (step 1), we select a part among all Y_n different parts (step 2). Recalling definitions (2.2) and (2.4) of the random variables $Y_{m,s}^{(n)}$ and Y_n, respectively, we obtain in a similar way that

$$\mathbb{P}(\{\lambda \in \Lambda(n)\} \times \{\mu_{n,2} = m, \sigma_{n,2} \leq s\}) = \left(\frac{1}{p(n)}\right)\left(\frac{Y_{m,s}^{(n)}}{Y_n}\right)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu_{n,2} = m, \sigma_{n,2} \leq s) = \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{Y_{m,s}^{(n)}}{Y_n}\right). \tag{2.6}$$

Procedure 3. Given a partition $\lambda \in \Lambda(n)$ chosen uar (step 1), we select a part of λ with the probability proportional to its size and multiplicity (step 2). Thus we set

$$\mathbb{P}(\{\lambda \in \Lambda(n)\} \times \{\mu_{n,3} = m, \sigma_{n,3} \leq s\}) = \left(\frac{1}{p(n)}\right)\left(\frac{m}{n}\right) \sum_{1 \leq j \leq s} j I_{\{\alpha_j^{(n)} = m\}}, \tag{2.7}$$

which in turn implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu_{n,3} = m, \sigma_{n,3} \leq s) = \frac{m}{n} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq s} j Pr(\alpha_j^{(n)} = m). \tag{2.8}$$

Remark. Sampling procedure 3 can be interpreted in terms of Ferrers diagrams - the graphical representations of the integer partitions $\lambda \in \Lambda(n)$ [2; Chapter 1.3]. It is obtained as follows. We use the notation λ_k to denote the kth largest part of λ for k a positive integer; if the number of parts Z_n of λ is $< k$, then $\lambda_k = 0$. The Ferrers diagram illustrates (1.1) by a two-dimensional array of dots, composed by λ_1 dots in the first (most left) row, λ_2 dots in the second row, ..., λ_{Z_n} dots in the last Z_nth row. Therefore, a Ferrers diagram may be considered as a union of disjoint blocks (rectangles) of dots with base j and height $\alpha_j^{(n)}$ (the multiplicity of part j). So, (2.7) and (2.8) imply that the sampling probability in Procedure 3 is proportional to the area of the block to which the chosen part belongs.

3 Statement of the Main Results and Brief Description of the Method of Proof

For sampling procedures 1 - 3, we have proved the following limit theorems.

Theorem 1 *For the reals u and v, we let*

$$F(u,v)=\begin{cases} 0 & \text{if} \quad \min\{u,v\}\le 0 \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad \min\{u,v\}>0 \quad \text{but} \quad u+v\le 1, \\ u+v-1 & \text{if} \quad 0<u\le 1, 0<v\le 1 \quad \text{and} \quad u+v>1, \\ \min\{1,v\} & \text{if} \quad u>1 \quad \text{and} \quad 0<v\le 1, \\ \min\{1,u\} & \text{if} \quad v>1 \quad \text{and} \quad 0<u\le 1, \\ 1 & \text{if} \quad u>1 \quad \text{and} \quad v>1. \end{cases}$$

Then, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{2\log\mu_{n,1}}{\log n}\le u, \frac{2\log\sigma_{n,1}}{\log n}\le v\right)=F(u,v).$$

Theorem 2 *Let $0<t<\infty$. Then, for any positive integer m, we have*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_{n,2}=m, \frac{\pi\sigma_{n,2}}{\sqrt{6n}}\le t\right)=\int_0^t e^{-my}(1-e^{-y})dy.$$

Theorem 3 *Let $0<t<\infty$. Then, for any positive integer m, we have*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_{n,3}=m, \frac{\pi\sigma_{n,3}}{\sqrt{6n}}\le t\right)=\frac{6m}{\pi^2}\int_0^t y(1-e^{-y})e^{-my}dy.$$

Remark 1. Since the inequalities $\frac{2\log\mu_{n,1}}{\log n}\le u, \frac{2\log\sigma_{n,1}}{\log n}\le v$ are equivalent to $\mu_{n,1}\le n^{u/2}, \sigma_{n,1}\le n^{v/2}$, respectively, Theorem 1 implies that the proportion of parts of size $\le n^{v/2}$ and multiplicity $\le n^{u/2}$, $0<u,v<1$, is approximately equal to $u+v-1$ if $u+v>1$; if $u+v\le 1$ this proportion approaches zero as $n\to\infty$. For the other two sampling procedures, Theorems 2 and 3 show that typically chosen part sizes are of order $const\sqrt{n}$, while their multiplicities are finite - both converge weakly to discrete random variables whose support is the set $\{1,2,...\}$.

Remark 2. For the sake of completeness, we present here a list of the known marginal limiting distributions for the size and multiplicity of the randomly-chosen part. They can be obtained as corollaries of Theorems 1-3. Proper references are also given.

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{2\log\mu_{n,1}}{\log n}\le t\right)=t, \quad 0<t<1$$

[3; p.195];

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{2\log\sigma_{n,1}}{\log n}\le t\right)=t, \quad 0<t<1$$

[6; p.712];

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}(\mu_{n,2}=m)=\frac{1}{m(m+1)}, \quad m=1,2,..$$

[3; p.192];

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\pi\sigma_{n,2}}{\sqrt{6n}} \le t\right) = 1 - e^{-t} \quad 0 < t < \infty$$

[13; Theorem 2];

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(\mu_{n,2} = m) = \frac{6(2m+1)}{\pi^2 m(m+1)^2}, \quad m = 1, 2, ...$$

[3; p. 195];

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\pi\sigma_{n,3}}{\sqrt{6n}} \le t\right) = \frac{6}{\pi^2}\int_0^t \frac{y}{e^y - 1}dy, \quad 0 < t < \infty$$

[13; Theorem 3].

We conclude this section with a description of our method of proof. It combines probabilistic with analytical tools. We employ Fristedt's conditioning device [6], which allows to transfer probability distributions of linear combinations of the multiplicities $\alpha_j^{(n)}$ into conditional distributions of the corresponding linear combinations of independent and geometrically distributed random variables. Using this method, we show that, as $n \to \infty$, the expected values in (2.5) and (2.6) are close to the ratios of the expectations of the random variables that are involved there. The asymptotic behavior of the expectations of Y_n and Z_n, defined by (2.4) and (2.3), respectively, is well known:

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_n) \sim \sqrt{6n}/\pi, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\mathbb{E}(Z_n) \sim (\sqrt{6n}/2\pi)\log n \tag{3.2}$$

(see [16] and [3], respectively). We use combinatorial enumeration identities for generating functions, Cauchy coefficient formula and the saddle-point method in terms of Hayman admissibility theory [10] (see also [5; Chapter VIII.5]) to obtain the asymptotic behavior of $\mathbb{E}(Z_{d,s}^{(n)})$ (see (2.5)). Finally, (2.6)) and (2.8) are analyzed using an approach developed by Corteel et al. [3] and based on Euler-MacLaurin sum formula.

4 Generating Functions and the Analytical Background of the Proofs

We start with the notation $g(x)$ for the generating function of the sequence $\{p(n)\}_{n\ge1}$. For $\mid x \mid < 1$, $g(x)$ admits the well known representation

$$g(x) = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} p(n)x^n = \prod_{k=1}^{\infty}(1 - x^k)^{-1} \tag{4.1}$$

(see e.g. [2; Theorem 1.1]). Our first lemma is related to the probability generating function and the expectation of the random variable $Z_{d,s}^{(n)}$, defined by (2.1).

Lemma 1 *For any reals $d, s \geq 1$ and complex variables x and z, satisfying $|x| < 1$ and $|z| < 1$, we have*

$$1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} p(n) x^n \mathbb{E}(z^{Z_{d,s}^{(n)}}) = g(x) \prod_{1 \leq j \leq s} \frac{(1 - (zx^j)^{d+1})(1 - x^j)}{1 - zx^j}. \tag{4.2}$$

Moreover

$$1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} p(n) x^n \mathbb{E}(Z_{d,s}^{(n)}) \tag{4.3}$$

$$= g(x) \left(\sum_{1 \leq j \leq s} \frac{x^j}{1 - x^j} - (d+1) \sum_{1 \leq j \leq s} \frac{x^{j(d+1)}}{1 - x^{j(d+1)}} \right) \prod_{1 \leq j \leq s} (1 - x^{j(d+1)}).$$

Proof. The generating function identity (4.2) follows from a more general argument developed in [15; Chapter V.5]. To state it we need some preliminary notations. We let $B \subset \{1, 2, ...\}$ and let $\Omega_j \subset \mathcal{N}_0 = \{0, 1, ...\}, j \geq 1$, be a sequence of sets. By $\widetilde{\sum}$ we denote a sum over all $j \in B$, satisfying (1.1) with $m_j \in \Omega_j, j \geq 1$. Then, we have

$$\prod_{j \in B} \sum_{m_j \in \Omega_j} (z_j x^j)^{m_j} = 1 + \sum_{n \geq 1} x^n \widetilde{\sum} z_1^{m_1} z_2^{m_2} ... z_n^{m_n}, \tag{4.4}$$

where $x, z_1, z_2, ...$ are formal variables. In (4.4) we set $B = \{1, 2, ..., [s]\}$,

$$\Omega_j = \begin{cases} \{0, 1, ..., [d]\} & \text{if} \quad j \leq s, \\ \mathcal{N}_0 & \text{if} \quad j > s \end{cases}$$

and

$$x_j = \begin{cases} x & \text{if} \quad j \leq s, \\ 1 & \text{if} \quad j > s. \end{cases}$$

(Here $[s]$ and $[d]$ denote the integer parts of s and d, respectively.) The required identity (4.2) now follows from (2.1) and (4.1). A differentiation with respect to z in (4.2) leads to the the expectations of $Z_{d,s}^{(n)}$ and identity (4.3). ■

The next lemma establishes a similar generating function identity for the random variable $Y_{m,s}^{(n)}$ defined by (2.2). It can be proved repeating the argument from [3; Theorem 1].

Lemma 2 *For any real number $s \geq 1$, positive integer m and complex variables x and z, satisfying $|x| < 1$ and $|z| < 1$, we have*

$$1 + \sum_{n \geq 1, j \geq 0} x^n \mathbb{E}(z^{Y_{m,s}^{(n)}}) = g(x) \prod_{1 \leq k \leq s} (1 + (z-1) x^{mk} (1 - x^k)).$$

This in turn implies that

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_{m,s}^{(n)}) = \sum_{1 \leq k \leq s} (p(n - mk) - p(n - (m+1)k)). \tag{4.5}$$

Further on, for the sake of simplicity, we let

$$c = \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}}. \tag{4.6}$$

We notice that Hardy-Ramanujan-Rademacher's formula in its form (1.3) implies that

$$p(n) = \frac{e^{2cn^{1/2}}}{4\sqrt{3}n}(1 + O(n^{-1/2})), \quad n \to \infty.$$

Using this expression, Corteel et al. [3; p. 190] have obtained the following asymptotic estimates.

Lemma 3 *For enough large n, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p(n-mj)}{p(n)} &= \left(1 + O\left(\frac{mj}{n^{3/2}}\right) + O((n-mj)^{-1/2})\right) e^{-cmj/n^{1/2}} \\ &= \begin{cases} (1 + O(n^{-1/2}))e^{-cmj/n^{1/2}} & \text{if} \quad mj \le n/2, \\ O(e^{-cn^{1/2}/2}) & \text{if} \quad mj > n/2. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Lemma 3 enables us to interpret the sum in (4.5) as a Riemann integral sum.

Our next preliminary fact is related to Hardy-Ramanujan formula (1.2). We shall present it into a slightly different form, which will be used further to find the asymptotic of $\mathbb{E}(Z_{d,s}^{(n)})$. To introduce the reader into the subject, we notice that Hardy-Ramanujan formula has been subsequently generalized in various directions most notably by Meinardus [11] (see also [2; Chapter 6]). Meinardus obtained the asymptotic of the Taylor coefficients of infinite products of the form

$$\prod_{k=1}^{\infty}(1 - x^k)^{-b_k} \tag{4.8}$$

under certain general assumptions on the sequence of non-negative numbers $\{b_k\}_{k\ge 1}$. Meinardus approach is based on considering the Dirichlet generating series

$$D(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k k^{-z}, \quad z = u + iv. \tag{4.9}$$

Since we shall use this result, below we briefly describe Meinardus assumptions avoiding their precise statements as well as some extra notations and concepts. The first Meinardus assumption (M_1) specifies the domain $\mathcal{H} = \{z : \Re(z) = u \ge -C_0\}, 0 < C_0 < 1$, in the complex plane, in which $D(z)$ has an analytic continuation. The second one (M_2) is related to the asymptotic behavior of $D(z)$, whenever $\mid \Im(z) \mid = \mid v \mid \to \infty$. A function of the complex variable z which is bounded by $O(\mid \Im(z) \mid^{C_1}), 0 < C_1 < \infty$, in certain domain of the complex plane is called function of finite order. Meinardus second condition (M_2) requires that $D(z)$ is of finite order in the whole domain $\mathcal{H}$. Finally, the Meinardus third condition (M_3) implies a bound on the ordinary generating

function of the sequence $\{b_k\}_{k\geq 1}$. It can be stated in a way simpler than the Meinardus original expression by the inequality

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k e^{-k\omega} \sin^2(\pi k u) \geq C_2 \omega^{-\epsilon_1}, \quad 0 < \frac{\omega}{2\pi} <\mid u \mid< \frac{1}{2},$$

for sufficiently small ω and some constants $C_2, \epsilon_1 > 0$ ($C_2 = C_2(\epsilon_1)$) (see [7; p. 310]).

It is known that Euler partition generating function $g(x)$ (which is obviously of the form (4.8)) satisfies the Meinardus scheme of conditions (M_1)-(M_3) (see e.g. [2; Theorem 6.3]).

The proof of our Theorem 1 will be based on an asymptotic analysis of a Cauchy integral stemming from (4.3). We shall apply there the saddle-point method in the sense of Hayman [10] (see also [5; Chapter VIII.5]). In [10] Hayman studied a wide class of power series satisfying a set of relatively mild conditions and established general formulas for the asymptotic order of their coefficients. In the proof of Theorem 1 we shall essentially use that the generating function $g(x)$ is admissible in the sense of Hayman. To present Hayman's idea and show how it can be applied, we need to introduce some auxiliary notations.

We consider here a function $G(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} G_n x^n$ that is analytic for $\mid x \mid< \rho, 0 < \rho < \infty$. For $0 < r < \rho$, we let

$$a(r) = r\frac{G'(r)}{G(r)}, \tag{4.10}$$

$$b(r) = r\frac{G'(r)}{G(r)} + r^2\frac{G''(r)}{G(r)} - r^2\left(\frac{G'(r)}{G(r)}\right). \tag{4.11}$$

In the statement of Hayman's result we use the terminology given in [5; Chapter VIII.5]. We assume that $G(x) > 0$ for $x \in (R_0, \rho) \subset (0, \rho)$ and satisfies the following three conditions.

Capture condition. $\lim_{r\to\rho} a(r) = \infty$ and $\lim_{r\to\rho} b(r) = \infty$.

Locality condition. For some function $\delta = \delta(r)$ defined over (R_0, ρ) and satisfying $0 < \delta < \pi$, one has

$$G(re^{i\theta}) \sim G(r)e^{i\theta a(r) - \theta^2 b(r)/2}$$

as $r \to \rho$, uniformly for $\mid \theta \mid\leq \delta(r)$.

Decay condition.

$$G(re^{i\theta}) = o\left(\frac{G(r)}{\sqrt{b(r)}}\right)$$

as $r \to \rho$, uniformly for $\delta(r) \leq \theta < \pi$.

Hayman Theorem. Let $G(x)$ be Hayman admissible function and $r = r_n$ be the unique solution in the interval (R_0, ρ) of the equation

$$a(r) = n. \tag{4.12}$$

Then the Taylor coefficients of $G(x)$ satisfy, as $n \to \infty$,

$$G_n \sim \frac{G(r_n)}{r_n^n \sqrt{2\pi b(r_n)}} \tag{4.13}$$

with $b(r_n)$ given by (4.11).

The next lemma presents an alternative formula for the partition function $p(n)$.

Lemma 4 *If $r = r_n$ satisfies (4.12) for sufficiently large n, then*

$$p(n) \sim \frac{r_n^n g(r_n)}{\sqrt{2\pi b(r_n)}}, \quad n \to \infty,$$

where $a(r_n)$ and $b(r_n)$ are given by (4.10)and (4.11) with $G(x) \equiv g(x)$.

Proof. Since in (4.1) we have $b_k = 1, k \geq 1$, the Dirichlet generating series (4.9) is $D(z) = \zeta(z)$, where ζ denotes the Riemann zeta function. We set in (4.10) and (4.11) $r = r_n = e^{-h_n}, h_n > 0$, where h_n is the unique solution of the equation

$$a(e^{-h_n}) = n. \tag{4.14}$$

((4.14) is an obvious modification of (4.12).) Granovsky et al. [7] showed that the first two Meinardus conditions imply that the unique solution of (4.14) has the following asymptotic expansion:

$$h_n = \sqrt{\zeta(2)/n} + \frac{\zeta(0)}{2n} + O(n^{-1-\beta}) = \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6n}} - \frac{1}{4n} + O(n^{-1-\beta}), \tag{4.15}$$

where $\beta > 0$ is fixed constant (here we have also used that $\zeta(0) = -1/2$; see [1; Chapter 23.2]). We also notice that (4.11) and (4.15) impliy that

$$b(e^{-h_n}) = 2\zeta(2)h_n^{-3} + O(h_n^{-2}) \sim \frac{\pi^2}{3} h_n^{-3} \sim \frac{2\sqrt{6}}{\pi} n^{3/2} \tag{4.16}$$

(see [12; Lemma 2.2] with $D(z) = \zeta(z)$). Hence, by (4.14) and (4.16), $a(e^{-h_n}) \to \infty$ and $b(e^{-h_n}) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$, that is, Hayman's "capture" condition is satisfied with $r = r_n = e^{-h_n}$. To show next that Hayman's "decay" condition is satisfied by $g(x)$ we set

$$\delta_n = \frac{h_n^{4/3}}{\Omega(n)} = \frac{\pi^{4/3}}{(6n)^{2/3}\Omega(n)} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right) \tag{4.17}$$

with h_n given by (4.15), where $\Omega(n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$ arbitrarily slowly. We can apply now an estimate for $\mid g(e^{-h_n+i\theta}) \mid$ established in a general form in [12; Lemma 2.4] using all three Meinardus conditions. It states that there are two positive constants c_0 and ϵ_0, such that, for sufficiently large n,

$$\mid g(e^{-h_n+i\theta}) \mid \leq g(e^{-h_n}) e^{-c_0 h_n^{-\epsilon_0}} \tag{4.18}$$

uniformly for $\delta_n \leq |\ \theta\ | < \pi$. This, in combination with (4.16), implies that $|\ g(e^{-h_n+i\theta})\ | = o(g(e^{-h_n})/\sqrt{b(e^{-h_n})})$ uniformly in the same range for θ, which is just Hayman's "decay" condition. Finally, by Lemma 2.3 of [12], established using Meinardus conditions (M_1) and (M_2), Hayman's "locality" condition is also satisfied by $g(x)$. In fact, this lemma implies in the particular case $D(z) = \zeta(z)$ that

$$e^{-i\theta n}\frac{g(e^{-h_n+i\theta})}{g(e^{-h_n})} = e^{-\theta^2 b(e^{-h_n})/2}(1 + O(1/\Omega^3(n)) \tag{4.19}$$

uniformly for $|\ \theta\ | \leq \delta_n$, where $b(e^{-h_n})$ and δ_n are determined by (4.16) and (4.17), respectively. Hence all conditions of Hayman's theorem hold and we can apply it with $G_n = p(n), G(x) = g(x), r_n = e^{-h_n}$ and $\rho = 1$ to find that

$$p(n) \sim \frac{e^{nh_n} g(e^{-h_n})}{\sqrt{2\pi b(e^{-h_n})}}, \quad n \to \infty, \tag{4.20}$$

which completes the proof. ■

Remark. To show that formula (4.20) yields (1.2), one has to replace (4.15) and (4.16) in the right hand side of (4.20). The asymptotic of $g(e^{-h_n})$ is determined by a general lemma due to Meinardus [11] (see also [2; Lemma 6.1]). Since $\zeta(0) = -1/2$ and $\zeta'(0) = -\frac{1}{2}\log(2\pi)$ (see [1; Chapter 23.2]), in the particular case of $g(e^{-h_n})$ this lemma implies that

$$\begin{aligned} g(e^{-h_n}) &= \exp\left(\zeta(2)h_n^{-1} - \zeta(0)\log h_n + \zeta'(0) + O(h_n^{c_1})\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{\pi^2}{6h_n} + \frac{1}{2}\log h_n - \frac{1}{2}\log(2\pi) + O(h_n^{c_1})\right), \quad n \to \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where $0 < c_1 < 1$. The rest of the computation leading to (1.2) is based on simple algebraic manipulations and cancellations.

5 Proof of Theorem 1

We base our proof on the definition of Sampling Procedure 1 and eq. (2.5). We want to replace the expected value in its right-hand side by the ratio $\mathbb{E}(Z_{d,s}^{(n)})/\mathbb{E}(Z_n)$. So, we notice first that Erdös and Lehner [4] proved that, in probability, the total number of parts Z_n is asymptotic to $\mathbb{E}(Z_n)$ as $n \to \infty$. Hence, for any $\epsilon > 0$, the probability of the event

$$A_n = \left\{ \lambda \in \Lambda(n) :|\ \frac{Z_n}{\mathbb{E}(Z_n)} - 1\ | > \epsilon \right\}$$

tends to 0 as $n \to \infty$. Further, we rewrite (2.5) in the following way:

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu_{n,1} \leq d, \sigma_{n,1} \leq s) = \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{Z_{d,s}^{(n)}}{Z_n} I_{A_n^c}\right) + \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{Z_{d,s}^{(n)}}{Z_n} I_{A_n}\right). \tag{5.1}$$

For $\lambda \in A_n^c$ and $0 < \epsilon < 1$, we have $(1-\epsilon)\mathbb{E}(Z_n) \le Z_n \le (1+\epsilon)\mathbb{E}(Z_n)$ and therefore,

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}(Z_{d,s}^{(n)})}{(1+\epsilon)\mathbb{E}(Z_n)} \le \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{Z_{d,s}^{(n)}}{Z_n} I_{A_n^c}\right) \le \frac{\mathbb{E}(Z_{d,s}^{(n)})}{(1-\epsilon)\mathbb{E}(Z_n)}. \tag{5.2}$$

Since $Z_{d,s}^{(n)} \le Z_n$, the second summand in (5.1) is not greater than $\mathbb{P}(A_n)$. Hence, combining (5.1) and (5.2), we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu_{n,1} \le d, \sigma_{n,1} \le s) = (1+O(\epsilon))\frac{\mathbb{E}(Z_{d,s}^{(n)})}{\mathbb{E}(Z_n)} + \mathbb{P}(A_n).$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ and then $\epsilon \to 0$ and replacing $\mathbb{E}(Z_n)$ by the right-hand side of (3.2), uniformly for $d, s \ge 1$, we finally get

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu_{n,1} \le d, \sigma_{n,1} \le s) \sim \frac{2\pi\mathbb{E}(Z_{d,s}^{(n)})}{\sqrt{6n}\log n} = \frac{2c\mathbb{E}(Z_{d,s}^{(n)})}{\sqrt{n}\log n}, \tag{5.3}$$

where c is the constant from (4.6).

Our proof continues with an application of Cauchy coefficient formula to (4.3). We use the circle $x = e^{-h_n+i\theta}, -\pi < \theta \le \pi$, as a contour of integration and the notation

$$\varphi_{d,s}(x) = \left(\sum_{1\le j\le s} \frac{x^j}{1-x^j} - (d+1)\sum_{1\le j\le s} \frac{x^{j(d+1)}}{1-x^{j(d+1)}}\right) \prod_{1\le j\le s} (1-x^{j(d+1)}) \tag{5.4}$$

to obtain

$$p(n)\mathbb{E}(Z_{d,s}^{(n)}) = \frac{e^{nh_n}}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} g(e^{-h_n+i\theta})\varphi_{d,s}(e^{-h_n+i\theta})e^{-i\theta n}d\theta.$$

Then, we break up the range of integration as follows:

$$p(n)\mathbb{E}(Z_{d,s}^{(n)}) = J_1(d,s,n) + J_2(d,s,n), \tag{5.5}$$

where

$$J_1(d,s,n) = \frac{e^{nh_n}}{2\pi}\int_{-\delta_n}^{\delta_n} g(e^{-h_n+i\theta})\varphi_{d,s}(e^{-h_n+i\theta})d\theta, \tag{5.6}$$

$$J_2(d,s,n) = \frac{e^{nh_n}}{2\pi}\int_{\delta_n<|\theta|\le\pi} g(e^{-h_n+i\theta})\varphi_{d,s}(e^{-h_n+i\theta})d\theta \tag{5.7}$$

and δ_n is defined by (4.17).

In our next step we set

$$d = n^{u/2}, \quad s = n^{v/2}, \quad 0 \le u, v \le 1 \tag{5.8}$$

and obtain estimates for the sums:

$$S_1 = \sum_{1\le j\le s} \frac{e^{-jh_n}}{1-e^{-jh_n}}, \tag{5.9}$$

$$S_2 = \sum_{1\le j\le s} \frac{e^{-j(d+1)h_n}}{1-e^{-j(d+1)h_n}}. \tag{5.10}$$

Here the sequence $\{h_n\}_{n\ge 1}$ is defined by (4.15).

Using the approximation of a Riemann sum by an integral, (4.15), (5.8) and (4.6), for S_1 we get

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right)\sqrt{n}\sum_{1\le j\le n^{v/2}} \frac{e^{-cj/\sqrt{n}}}{1-e^{-cj/\sqrt{n}}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \\ &\sim \sqrt{n}\int_{1/\sqrt{n}}^{n^{\frac{v-1}{2}}} \frac{e^{-cz}}{1-e^{-cz}}dz = \frac{\sqrt{n}}{c}\int_{c/\sqrt{n}}^{n^{\frac{v-1}{2}}} \frac{e^{-z}}{1-e^{-z}}dz \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{n}}{c}\log\left(\frac{1-e^{-cn^{\frac{v-1}{2}}}}{1-e^{-c/\sqrt{n}}}\right) = \frac{v\sqrt{n}}{2c}\log n + O(n^{v/2}). \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

In the same way one can show that

$$S_2 = \begin{cases} \frac{1-u}{2c}n^{\frac{1-u}{2}}\log n + O(n^{\frac{1-u}{2}}) & \text{if} \quad v+u\ge 1, \\ \frac{v}{2c}n^{\frac{1-u}{2}}\log n + O(n^{\frac{1-u}{2}}) & \text{if} \quad v+u<1. \end{cases} \tag{5.12}$$

We are now ready to find an estimate for the second integral in (5.5) (see (5.7)). First, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|\prod_{1\le j\le s}(1-e^{-h_n j(d+1)+ij\theta(d+1)}\ )| \\ &\le \prod_{1\le j\le s}(1-e^{-h_n j(d+1)}) + \prod_{1\le j\le s} e^{-h_n j(d+1)}\ |\ 1-e^{ij\theta(d+1)}\ | \\ &\le 1+e^{-h_n(d+1)s}(1+\prod_{1\le j\le s}|\ e^{ij\theta(d+1)}\ |) = 1+2e^{-h_n(d+1)s} \le 3. \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

Hence, in terms of notations (5.4), (5.9) and (5.10), by (5.8), (5.11) and (5.12),

$$|\ \varphi_{d,s}(e^{-h_n+i\theta})\ | = O((S_1+(d+1)S_2) = O(\sqrt{n}\log n), \quad -\pi\le\theta\le\pi.$$

Replacing this estimate and applying inequality (4.18) to the integrand of (5.7), we obtain

$$|\ J_2(d,s,n)\ | = O(e^{nh_n}g(e^{-h_n})\sqrt{n}(\log n)e^{-c_0h_n^{-\epsilon_0}}).$$

The required estimate now follows from (4.16) and (4.20) in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} &|\ J_2(d,s,n)\ | = O\left(\frac{e^{nh_n}g(-e^{-h_n})}{\sqrt{b(e^{-h_n})}}n^{1/2+3/4}(\log n)e^{-c_0h_n^{-\epsilon_0}}\right) \\ &= O(p(n)n^{5/4}(\log n)e^{-c_0h_n^{-\epsilon_0}}) = O(p(n)n^{5/4}(\log n)e^{-c_0'n^{\epsilon_0/2}}) \\ &= o(\sqrt{n}(\log n)p(n)), \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

where $c_0' > 0$.

The estimate for $J_1(d,s,n)$ follows from Hayman's "locality" condition (4.19). First, we need to expand $\varphi_{d,s}$ by Taylor formula. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_{d,s}(e^{-h_n+i\theta}) &= \varphi_{d,s}(e^{-h_n}) + O\left(\mid\theta\mid \frac{d}{dx}\varphi_{d,s}(x)\mid_{x=e^{-h_n}}\right)\\ &= \varphi_{d,s}(e^{-h_n}) + O\left(\delta_n \frac{d}{dx}\varphi_{d,s}(x)\mid_{x=e^{-h_n}}\right). \qquad (5.15)\end{aligned}$$

To find the asymptotic of $\varphi_{d,s}(e^{-h_n})$, in addition to (5.11) and (5.12), we also need the limit of $\prod_{1\le j\le s}(1-e^{-j(d+1)h_n})$ as $n\to\infty$, whenever d and s satisfy (5.8) (see (5.4)). Using approximations by Riemann integrals as in the analysis of S_1 and S_2, it is easy to show that

$$\prod_{1\le j\le s}(1-e^{-j(d+1)h_n}) = \exp\left(\sum_{1\le j\le s}\log\left(1-e^{-j(d+1)h_n}\right)\right) \to \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if} \quad v+u\ge 1,\\ 0 & \text{if} \quad v+u<1.\end{cases}$$

Hence, from (5.8)-(5.12) it follows that

$$\varphi_{d,s}(e^{-h_n}) \begin{cases} \sim \frac{u+v-1}{2c}\sqrt{n}\log n & \text{if} \quad v+u\ge 1,\\ = o(\sqrt{n}) & \text{if} \quad v+u<1.\end{cases} \qquad (5.16)$$

The estimate of the error term in (5.15) is tedious and follows the same line of reasoning. We have

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dx}\varphi_{d,s}(x)\mid_{x=e^{-h_n}}\\ &= \left(\sum_{1\le j\le s}\frac{jx^{j-1}}{(1-x^j)^2} - (d+1)\sum_{1\le j\le s}\frac{jx^{j(d+1)}}{(1-x^{j(d+1)})^2}\right)\\ &\times\left(\prod_{1\le j\le s}(1-x^{j(d+1)})\right)\mid_{x=e^{-h_n}} + \left(\prod_{1\le j\le s}(1-x^{j(d+1)})\right)\\ &\times\exp\left(-(d+1)\sum_{1\le j\le s}\frac{jx^{j(d+1)-1}}{1-x^{j(d+1)}}\right)\mid_{x=e^{-h_n}}. \qquad (5.17)\end{aligned}$$

It can be seen that the first two sums in the right-hand side of (5.17) are of order $O(n\log n)$, while the first product factor is estimated by (5.13). Hence, the first summand in (5.17) is of order $O(n\log n)$. For the sum in the exponent of the second summand of the right-hand side of (5.17), one can show that there exists a constant $C>0$ such that

$$(d+1)\sum_{1\le j\le s}\frac{jx^{j(d+1)-1}}{1-x^{j(d+1)}}\mid_{x=e^{-h_n}} \ge C\sqrt{n}\log n.$$

Therefore the second summand in (5.17) is $O(e^{-C\sqrt{n}\log n})$. Hence

$$\frac{d}{dx}\varphi_{d,s}(x)\mid_{x=e^{-h_n}} = O(n\log n)$$

and by (4.17) and (5.16), the expansion in (5.15) becomes

$$\varphi_{d,s}(e^{-h_n+i\theta}) = \varphi_{d,s}(e^{-h_n}) + O\left(\frac{n^{1/3}\log n}{\Omega(n)}\right), \tag{5.18}$$

where $\Omega(n)\to\infty$ as $n\to\infty$ arbitrarily slowly. Inserting this estimate and (4.19) into (5.6) and applying the asymptotic for the partition function $p(n)$ from (4.20), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1(d,s,n) &= \frac{e^{nh_n}g(e^{-h_n})}{2\pi}\left(\int_{-\delta_n}^{\delta_n} e^{-\theta^2 b(e^{-d_n})/2}(1+O(1/\Omega^3(n))d\theta\right)\\
&\times\left(\varphi_{d,s}(e^{-h_n}) + O\left(\frac{n^{1/3}\log n}{\Omega(n)}\right)\right)\\
&\sim \frac{e^{nh_n}g(e^{-h_n})}{\sqrt{b(e^{-h_n})}2\pi}\left(\int_{-\delta_n\sqrt{b(e^{-h_n})}}^{\delta_n\sqrt{b(e^{-h_n})}} e^{-y^2/2}dy\right)\left(\varphi_{d,s}(e^{-h_n}) + O\left(\frac{n^{1/3}\log n}{\Omega(n)}\right)\right)\\
&\sim \frac{e^{nh_n}g(e^{-h_n})}{\sqrt{b(e^{-h_n})}2\pi}\left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-y^2/2}dy\right)\left(\varphi_{d,s}(e^{-h_n}) + O\left(\frac{n^{1/3}\log n}{\Omega(n)}\right)\right)\\
&= \frac{e^{nh_n}g(e^{-h_n})}{\sqrt{2\pi b(e^{-h_n})}}\left(\varphi_{d,s}(e^{-h_n}) + O\left(\frac{n^{1/3}\log n}{\Omega(n)}\right)\right)\\
&\sim p(n)\left(\varphi_{d,s}(e^{-h_n}) + O\left(\frac{n^{1/3}\log n}{\Omega(n)}\right)\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.19}$$

where for the second asymptotic equivalence we have used (4.16) and (4.17) in order to get

$$\delta_n\sqrt{b(e^{-h_n})} \sim \frac{\pi^{5/6}\sqrt{2}}{6^{1/6}\Omega(n)}n^{1/12}\to\infty$$

if $\Omega(n)\to\infty$ as $n\to\infty$ not too fast, so that $\frac{n^{1/12}}{\Omega(n)}\to\infty$. It is now clear that (5.5)-(5.7), (5.14) and (5.19) yield

$$p(n)\mathbb{E}(Z_{d,s}^{(n)}) = p(n)\varphi_{d,s}(e^{-h_n}) + o(p(n)\sqrt{n}\log n)$$

and therefore

$$\mathbb{E}(Z_{d,s}^{(n)}) = \varphi_{d,s}(e^{-h_n}) + o(\sqrt{n}\log n).$$

The result of Theorem 1 now follows from (5.3), (3.2), (4.6) and (5.16).

6 Proof of Theorem 2

We base our proof on (2.6), Lemmas 2 and 3 and asymptotic equivalence (3.1). To replace the expectation in the right hand side of (2.6) by the ratio $\mathbb{E}(Y_{m,s}^{(n)})/\mathbb{E}(Y_n)$, similarly to what we did in the proof of Theorem 1, we shall study how unlikely is the event

$$B_n = \left\{ \lambda \in \Lambda(n) :| \frac{cY_n(\lambda)}{\sqrt{n}} - 1 |> \epsilon \right\}, \quad \epsilon > 0,$$

where c is constant from (4.6). Using Fristeft's method [6], Corteel et al. [3] showed that

$$Pr(B_n) \le e^{-c_2\sqrt{n}}, \quad c_2 = c_2(\epsilon) > 0. \tag{6.1}$$

Remark. Fristedt's approach [6] is based on the identity

$$Pr(\alpha_j^{(n)} = m_j, j = 1, ..., n) = Pr\left(\gamma_j = m_j, j = 1, ..., n \mid \sum_{j\ge 1} j\gamma_j = n \right), \tag{6.2}$$

where $\{\gamma_j\}_{j\ge 1}$ is a sequence of independent geometrically distributed random variables, whose distribution is given by

$$Pr(\gamma_j = k) = (1 - q^j)q^{jk}, \quad k = 0, 1, ...$$

and $\{m_j\}_{j\ge 1}$ are non-negative integers. Eq. (6.2) holds for every fixed $q \in (0, 1)$. It is natural to take q so that $Pr(\sum_{j\ge 1} j\gamma_j = n)$ is as large as possible. Fristedt's almost optimal choice for q is $q = e^{-c/\sqrt{n}}$. Then, the bound in (6.1) is easily obtained using this value of q.

Next, we represent the probability in (2.6) in the following way

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu_{n,2} = m, \sigma_{n,2} \le s) = \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{Y_{m,s}^{(n)}}{Y_n} I_{B_n^c} \right) + \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{Y_{m,s}^{(n)}}{Y_n} I_{B_n} \right), \tag{6.3}$$

where I_{B_n} and $I_{B_n^c}$ denote the indicators of events B_n and B_n^c, respectively. Since, for any $\lambda \in B_n^c$,

$$\frac{c}{\sqrt{n}(1+\epsilon)} < \frac{1}{Y_n} < \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}(1-\epsilon)}$$

if $0 < \epsilon < 1$, the first summand in (6.3) is estimated by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{Y_{m,s}^{(n)}}{Y_n} I_{B_n^c} \right) &= \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}(1 + O(\epsilon))\mathbb{E}(Y_{m,s}^{(n)} I_{B_n^c}) \\ &= \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}(1 + O(\epsilon))(\mathbb{E}(Y_{m,s}^{(n)}) - \mathbb{E}(Y_{m,s}^{(n)} I_{B_n})). \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

Clearly, with probability 1, $Y_{m,s}^{(n)} \le n$. Hence, using (6.1), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_{m,s}^{(n)} I_{B_n})) = O(nPr(B_n)) = O(ne^{-c_2\sqrt{n}})$$

and (6.4) becomes

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{Y_{m,s}^{(n)}}{Y_n} I_{B_n^c}\right) = \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}(1+O(\epsilon))\mathbb{E}(Y_{m,s}^{(n)}) + O(ne^{-c_2\sqrt{n}}).$$

The second term in the right hand side of (6.3) is easily estimated using (6.1) since it is not greater than $Pr(B_n)$. Consequently,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu_{n,2} = m, \sigma_{n,2} \le s) = \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}(1+O(\epsilon))\mathbb{E}(Y_{m,s}^{(n)}) + O(ne^{-c_2\sqrt{n}}) \tag{6.5}$$

uniformly for any fixed integer $m \ge 1$ and real $s \ge 1$. Hence, our next task is to obtain an estimate for $\mathbb{E}(Y_{m,s}^{(n)})$, as $n \to \infty$, whenever $s = t\sqrt{n}/c$, $m \ge 1$ is fixed integer and $t \in (0, \infty)$ is also fixed. Combining results of (4.5) and (4.7) of Lemmas 2 and 3, respectively, and approximating the sum by the corresponding Riemann integral, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}(Y_{m,s}^{(n)}) = (1+O(1/\sqrt{n})) \\
&\times \sum_{1\le k\le c^{-1}\sqrt{n}t} (\exp(-cmk/\sqrt{n}) - \exp(-c(m+1)k/\sqrt{n})) \\
&\sim \sqrt{n}\int_0^{c^{-1}t} (e^{-cmy} - e^{-c(m+1)y})dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Replacing this expression into (6.5) and letting first $n \to \infty$ and then $\epsilon \to 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_{n,2} = m, \frac{c\sigma_{n,2}}{\sqrt{n}} \le t\right) \to c\int_0^{c^{-1}t} (e^{-cmy} - e^{-c(m+1)y})dy \\
&= \int_0^t e^{-my}(1-e^{-y})dy,
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 2.

7 Proof of Theorem 3

The proof will be based on an asymptotic analysis of formula (2.8), setting there $s = c^{-1}\sqrt{n}t$ as $n \to \infty$ (see again (4.6)) and assuming that m is fixed positive integer. First, we let $\Lambda_k(n)$ to denote the set of partitions of n with no part equal to k. Also, let $P_k(n) =\mid \Lambda_k(n) \mid$. In [3; p. 189] Corteel et al. give a combinatorial proof of the following identity:

$$Pr(\alpha_j^{(n)} = m) = \frac{P_j(n-mj)}{p(n)} = \frac{p(n-jm) - p(n-j(m+1))}{p(n)}.$$

Replacing this expression into the right hand side of (2.8) and applying (4.7), as in the proof of Theorem 2, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_{n,3}=m, \frac{c\sigma_{n,3}}{\sqrt{n}}\le t\right) \sim m \sum_{1\le j\le c^{-1}\sqrt{n}t} \frac{j}{\sqrt{n}}(e^{-cmj/\sqrt{n}}-e^{c(m+1)j/\sqrt{n}})\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$$

$$\to m\int_0^{c^{-1}t} y(e^{-cmy}-e^{-c(m+1)y})dy = \frac{m}{c^2}\int_0^t y(1-e^{-y})e^{-my}dy.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.

References

[1] Abramovitz, M., Stegun, I.A.: Handbook of Mathemathical Functions with Formulas, Graphs and Mathematical Tables. Dover Publ. Inc., New York (1965).

[2] Andrews, G.E.: The Theory of Partitions. Encyclopedia Math. Appl. 2. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA (1976).

[3] Corteel, S., Pittel, B., Savage, C.D., Wilf, H.S.: On the multiplicity of parts in a random partition. Random Stuct. Alg. 14, 185-197(1999).

[4] Erdös, P., Lehner, J.: The distribution of the number of summands in the partition of a positive integer. Duke Math. J. 8, 335-345(1941).

[5] Flajolet, P., Sedgewick, R.: Analytic Combinatorics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2009).

[6] Fristedt, B.: The structure of random partitions of large integers. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 337, 703-735 (1993).

[7] Granovsky, B., Stark, D., Erlihson, M.: Meinardus theorem on weighted partitions: Extensions and a probabilistic proof. Adv. Appl. Math. 41, 307-328 (2008).

[8] Grimmett, G., Stirzaker, D.: Probability and Random Processes. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2001).

[9] Hardy, G.H., Ramanujan, S.: Asymptotic formulae in combinatory analysis. Proc. London Math. Soc. 17(2), 75-115 (1918).

[10] Hayman, W.K.: A generalization of Stirling's formula. J. Reine Angew. Math. 196, 67-95 (1956).

[11] Meinardus, G.: Asymptotische Aussagen über Partitionen. Math. Z. 59, 388-398 (1954).

[12] Mutafchiev, L.: The size of the largest part of random weighted partitions of large integers. Combinatorics Probab. Comput. 22, 433-454 (2013).

[13] Mutafchiev, L.: Sampling part sizes of random integer partitions. The Ramanujan Journal, DOI10.1007/s11139-014-9559-6(2014).

[14] Rademacher, H.: On the partition function $p(n)$. Proc. London Math. Soc. 43, 241-254 (1937).

[15] Sachkov, V.N.: Combinatorial Methods in Discrete Mathematics. Encyclopedia Math. Appl. 55. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1999).

[16] Wilf, H.: Three problems in combinatorial analysis. J. Combin. Theory Ser. A 35, 199-207 (1983).